



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STUDIES IN THE JEWISH LITURGY.

I. פָּרַס עַל שְׁמַע.

B.

THE synagogue service, in common with all human institutions, is a product of gradual development. It did not spring up in a day, nor was it completed by any one man. The religious spirit of the centuries, the religious genius of the whole people worked together for its establishment. As little as we can specify who first coined the words of language and made them common property, so little are we able to trace back in the various paragraphs of the prayers particulars of their origin and introduction into the service. So also in the case before us, no answer can be given to the questions how the paragraphs that make up "Perīsat Shema" grew into shape, when they were combined together, and at what period they were arranged in the order in which we now know them. At the present, the absolute lack of sources places the solution of these problems beyond our reach. But this much, at least, is certain, that these sections in their present arrangement were in existence long before the rise of Christianity. In the beginning of the Christian era these prayers were already discussed as if they were primitive institutions. Then, even, nothing was known of their origin, and it was set far back in the dimness of remote antiquity in accordance with the firmly established and deeply rooted workings of the national consciousness.

The schools of Shammai and Hillel¹ from the rabbinical side, and Josephus² from the Hellenistic, are in complete accord in declaring the twofold daily recital of the Shema to be a *Mosaic* institution—so venerable and hard and fast

¹ Cf. Mishna, *Berakhot*, I and II. Talm. *Berakhot* beginning.

² *Antiq.*, IV, 8, 13.

was the usage connected with our prayer in the eyes of these remote generations.

"5,845 verses," says Steinthal very pertinently, "are contained in the five books of Moses, and among them how many that are of wonderful beauty and deep meaning! Who then chose from these 5,845 verses the verse 'Hear, O Israel' as the banner legend of the Jews? Who? The men of the Great Synod¹." The old Jewish tradition which attributes the first arrangement of the congregational prayers to the *אנשי כנסת הגדולה* should rest on good foundation. We know, at least, nothing to adduce against the hypothesis that these prayers had already received their fixed shape in pre-Maccabean time, and that their grouping has thereafter remained the same throughout the centuries.

The service, which the synagogue built up and preserved, took its issue from the congregation. Beginning as the congregational service, it grew into shape as the expression of that which was common to the congregation — the profession of faith. The formulation of the belief that united all members of the community constituted the first element of the public liturgy, around which the other elements are woven as around their natural centre. From the one profession of faith, the whole complex of sections composing the prayer received its name (*קריאת שמע*, *פרס על שמע*); this remains its name for all time. The Biblical sections, which as the foundations of belief were incorporated in the prayer, were in the earliest times more numerous than they are to-day, as was recently fully shown in this REVIEW². We will here confine ourselves to those paragraphs which still constitute part of the prayer, and which have therefore passed through a longer period of development.

Confining our attention to the *שמע*, it must be remarked that we use this designation for the three Biblical sections as if they had always belonged together. But it is beyond

¹ Steinthal, H., *Über Juden und Judentum*, Berlin, 1906, p. 255.

² J. Q. R., XV, 398; cf. also R. E. J., XLVI, p. 214.

doubt that the three were not all adopted into the liturgy simultaneously. וַיֹּאמֶר, the third, is of later adoption than the two preceding it; otherwise it would be unintelligible why this passage from Numbers should stand after the two paragraphs from Deuteronomy; it would likewise be unintelligible why in Palestine it was, for a long time, not said at all in the evening¹. The only question that can arise is whether the first two sections שְׁמוֹעַ וְיִזְכֹּר received their position in the prayer simultaneously, or one later than the other. As far back as our information reaches they are quoted together, and their acceptance is attributed to the regulation of the daily twofold recitation mentioned in each of them. But we know that such derivations are mostly etiological, and that they give not so much the cause as the justification or explanation of the already existing institution. It is improbable that both sections found their way into the service at the same time. I incline towards the opinion that the oldest ritual contained the first section, שְׁמוֹעַ, alone.

This section holds quite an exceptional rank in the Pentateuch. Its first two sentences שְׁמוֹעַ וְיִזְכֹּר contain distinct teachings; all the following are, according to the simple meaning of the words, directions for complying with the injunctions of the first two sentences. Nowhere else in the Bible is the importance of a teaching emphasized so prominently; in no other passage is it commanded with the aid of so many words and images to engrave a precept on the tablets of the heart. With intense force it is impressed to hold ever before one's own eyes and to teach others this "first commandment" at all times, in all places, and in all situations of life. It is truly notable what care in style and expression the Thora devotes to this fundamental principle of belief. This fact did not escape the notice of the founders of our liturgy, and they made this

¹ Cf. *Bab. Berakhot*, 14 b; *Jer. ibid.*, I, 9 (3 d); *Halakhot Gedolot* (ed. Hildesheimer), p. 23: ועד השהא כמה כדנינו בארץ ישראל הכין נהיגין למימר באורחא: וקא סברי שמע וזכר הם שמוע נהיגין ביום ובלילה ויאמר אינו נהגא אלא ביום.

portion the profession of faith of the community, and the backbone of the service. Later exposition indeed turned the whole section to Halachic purposes, and entirely perverted the natural meaning. The expressions *בשכבך ובקומך* were also taken literally, and referred to the two times of prayer in every day¹. Once this interpretation was given, it was an easy matter to adopt the second section also into the service, since its importance is similarly emphasized in the Scriptures. Its contents offered no obstacle, as the theory of retribution that it reflects tallied with the stage of belief of the Jewish community immediately after the Exile.

Somewhat more complicated are the facts presented by the third section. In the Talmud² there are five reasons given for its adoption; but their very number makes them suspected. Why from all the laws was just that of the Fringes selected and incorporated in the daily prayers? The Halacha has in this case made a *propter hoc* out of the *post hoc*, and so inferred the peculiar importance now attached to the Fringes. But this view can hardly be the correct one. Why should the service bring one particular command so prominently into notice? And even if this were the intention, were there not far more important precepts that would sooner have been chosen? Is not, for instance, much more stress laid on the Sabbath in the Pentateuch, and was not this command more characteristic of Judaism? In point of fact the commandment of the Fringes did not furnish the occasion for the insertion of the paragraph *וַיֵּאמֶר* into the prayers; this lay rather in the close of the paragraph, in the mention of the Exodus from Egypt. Jeremiah had once proclaimed that the Exodus from Egypt would one day rank in importance below the later redemptions. The course of Jewish history

¹ Cf. *Sifre*, Deut. § 34 (ed. Friedmann, 74 b); Targum Jonathan in Deut. vi. 7. Josephus, *Antiq.*, IV, 8, 13: *Δις δ' ἐκάστης ἡμέρας ἀρχομένης τε αὐτῆς καὶ ὁπότε πρὸς ὕπνον ὥρα τρέπεσθαι . . .*

² *Bab. Ber.*, 12 b.

belied his word ; the earlier event marks the beginning of Israel's growing into a people ; it is the foundation of the covenant between God and Israel, the centre point of the whole of Jewish history. It attained directly to the rank of a dogma ; the belief in God became the belief in the God who had led the forefathers of the Jewish nation out of Egypt. We find the emphasizing of this redemption in its religious aspect expressed in the Pentateuch nowhere else in so clear and so pregnant a wording as at the close of our section ¹.

The possibility is not excluded that, in the earliest period, only the conclusion of the paragraph was recited ; later, the whole of the preceding section was adopted, and then symbolism had the opportunity and free scope for developing the special position of the Fringes command in the manner now familiar to us.

The bare recital of a profession of faith is too meagre to make up, for any length of time, the only element of a congregational service. It is therefore quite natural that the Biblical sections were enframed in an harmonious introduction and conclusion. The introduction first and foremost took the form of a summons to the praise of God—ברכו ; this was followed by the second of the sections, which to this day still precede the Shema. This is called in the Talmud ברכת תורה ². Its contents deal with the special relation in which Israel stands to God through the revelation on Mount Sinai. The thanks for the revelation lead up admirably to the recital of those passages which

¹ Herzfeld (*Geschichte*, III, p. 187) is of opinion that there are passages enough in the Pentateuch in which this Exodus is mentioned less incidentally ; but on comparison with the instances mentioned in *Berakhot* 12 b, we find that these verses are not so numerous and are not always applicable to the service. As a matter of fact, there is no other verse in the whole of the Pentateuch, in which the *religious* importance of the Exodus is so exclusively brought out as in the closing verse of the פסח ציצית.

² Jer. *Ber.*, I, 8 (3 c).

contain the foundations of belief. Corresponding with this introduction, there followed as conclusion to the Biblical sections the profession of the congregation that the revelation to their fathers was also their belief—*אמת ויציב*.

This solemn and detailed confession of faith soon became the daily morning prayer and was said immediately after sunrise. Thus there came in as a new paragraph the thanks for physical light, the praise for the reawakening of nature—*יִצֵר אֵר*. The liturgy was, in its earliest period, quite general in its contents and adaptable to every religious occasion at will, and it was only later that it became more specified. The analysis of our present prayers also shows the general elements to be the older, to which the more specific were attached. The conclusion too became expanded; for the mention of the Exodus from Egypt in the Shema made it appear necessary to alter the contents of the epilogue to correspond with it. So there grew up out of the former profession of belief the prayer of thanks for the deliverance—*גאולה*.

More than these conjectures about the order of the paragraphs belonging to the Shema we cannot offer, and an exact date cannot be ascertained in the present state of our sources. The examination of the context enables us to assert that various pieces from different periods are contained in the sections; we can even determine the relation of these parts to one another; but beyond this our knowledge does not let us go; the antiquity of all these elements is so high and so far removed from us that we must renounce the attempt to fix it definitely.

C.

Just as the whole complex has experienced changes, so have also the individual paragraphs within themselves; above all they have been subject to considerable expansion. Quotations in the early literature, variant readings in different rituals, and especially in the manuscript liturgies,

show a considerable number of variations in wording; with the more important of these we will here deal.

As to the wording of ברכו, the Mishna contains the following discussion: אמר ר' עקיבא מה מצינו בבית הכנסת אחד מרובין ואחר מועטין אומ' ברכו את ה' ר' ישמעאל אומר ברכו את ה' המבורך (*Berakhot*, VII, 3). R. Akiba here keeps to the wording of the corresponding praises in the Bible, especially in the Psalms. Sirach also has the similar formula וברכו לִבְּהִרְנֵנוּ וברכו עתה בכל לִבְּהִרְנֵנוּ וברכו ¹. R. Ishmael, on the other hand, adds the word המבורך. Later authorities laid great store by this word, as in their opinion it was a warrant of the Reader's not excluding himself from the congregation (*Jer. Ber.*, VII, 3, p. 11 c). If we may trust the text of the *Sifre*, the next generation after R. Ishmael already followed him ²; but even in the last generation of the Amoraim the adherents of R. Akiba had not entirely died out (cf. *Jer.*, *ibid.*; *Bab. Ber.*, 50 a). The response of the congregation, ברוך ה' המבורך, לעולם ועד, also finds its model in the Bible (cf. Ps. cxiii. 2, Dan. ii. 20). But whether it was employed from the beginning as the response of the congregation in the service appears to me doubtful. In the oldest period, as a response to the summons of the Reader, the congregation showed their readiness to take part in the prayers recited by him. The insertion of the response in the service presupposes that the summons ברכו was looked upon as a part of the prayers, and that therefore the practice of regular prayers was in vogue.

Zunz, following the example of Rapoport, separated out from the *Yotser* the later elements and fixed its original wording at forty-five words ³. The Siddur of Amram Gaon shows that even this estimate overshot the mark—that a text existed which ran as follows (p. 4 b): בְּאֵי אִמָּה יוֹצֵר:

¹ Sirach, xxxix. 35. Cf. also xlv. 25.

² *Sifre Deut.* § 306 (ed. Friedmann, p. 132 b): ר' יוסי אומר מנין לעומדים: ר' יוסי אומר ברכו את ה' המבורך ששנים אחריו ברוך ה' המבורך לעולם ועד ה"ל כי שם ה' אקרא הבו גודל לאלהינו

³ Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 369.

אור ובורא חושך עושה שלום ובורא את הכל המאיר לארץ ולדרים עליה ברחמים, טובו מחדש בכל יום תמיד מעשה בראשית, כאמור לעושה אורים גדולים כי לעולם חסדו. בא"י יוצר המאורות. This contraction goes back to Saadia and is recommended by him for private devotion, whereas for the congregation the fuller Yotser generally known was in use; for the individual in private worship was not allowed to say the Kedusha. But an analogous case of the contraction of an already existing long prayer is not known, and moreover, even if the Kedusha were not to be said, it was still not necessary to dispense with the whole of the richly worded section המאיר לארץ. As a matter of fact, for the private prayer there are handed down from earlier Geonim texts at much greater length. Cf. *Halakhot Gedolot* (ed. Hildesheimer), p. 224: מאי אין פורסי' על שמע דלא לימא מעשה מרכבה. קדוש וברוך יחיד ביוצר אור דשאלו מקמי רב נחשון גאון דמתא מחסיא. תפלת שחרית כאיזה צד יתפלל אדם כשהוא יחיד. ואמ' להו יאמר יוצר אור על כסדר עד שיגיע [ל] וכולם פותחין בקדושה ובטהרה ומברכין ומשבחין ומקדישין לאל שמו האל המלך הגדול הגבור והנורא קדוש הוא. ולו זמירות יאמרו ותושבחות ישמיעו כי הוא פועל גבורות ועושה חדשות בעל מלחמות זורע צדקות מ[צ](ש)מיח ישועות בורא רפואות אדון הנפלאות המחדש בכל יום תמיד מעשה בראשית כאמור לעושה אורים גדולים כי לעולם חסדו. ואור חדש בציון תאיר ונוכה כולנו במהרה לאורו בא"י יוצר המאורות. ומסיים תפלתו. ולמה ידלג קדושה וברוך (ו)[ש]אי אפשר ליחיד לומר קדושה וברוך והיינו דתנן אין פורסין על שמע פחות מעשרה Quite similarly, except for a minor disarrangement of the names, writes Zidkia b. Abraham, who was well read in the old literature¹: ויחיד המתפלל בינו לבין עצמו לא יזכיר אופנים. וחיות שהרי אינו רשאי לומר קדוש דקיימא לן אין היחיד אומר קדוש. וקיימא לן כל דבר שבקדושה לא יהא פחות מעשרה. וכן מצאתי בשם רב עמרם גאון ז"ל יחיד המתפלל . . . ובשם ר' נחשון [נמרנאי read] גאון זצ"ל מצאתי שאומר ונותנים רשות זה לזה להקדיש לעושה אורים גדולים כי לעולם חסדו ובשם ר' נמרונאי [נחשון read] גאון זצ"ל מצאתי

¹ שביי הלקט, ed. Buber, XIII, pp. 6b and 7a. For the later rabbinic literature cf. Orhot Hayyim מיושב ר' קדושה I, f. 11 c.

שאומר בשפה ברורה בנעימה ובקדושה כולם כאחד לאל הברוך נעימות יתנו וכו'. Finally, the prohibition forbidding a private worshipper to say the Kedusha in the Yotser is quite fictitious, and rightly rejected in the *Shibbole ha-Leket*.

In the Genizah fragments that I have examined, the same brief version of the Yotser reappears several times in remains of prayer books, viz. four times in Cambridge, twice in Oxford, and once in a fragment in the possession of Dr. Gaster, without any special directions for, or the least limitations of, its use being noted. We may well suppose that in this formula a remnant of the old ritual of *Palestine* lies before us. The Palestinian ritual held sway in Egypt and long kept its ground there. Saadia has numerous and noteworthy texts taken from it, and many peculiarities even in Maimuni's ritual are to be traced back to the same source. So also the Siddur manuscripts from Egypt have preserved this text.

The wording agrees almost exactly with Saadia's in all the fragments; they one and all read ולדרין, and vary in respect of טובו. Bodl. Heb. f. 22 (*Catal.*, No. 2728), Taylor-Schechter H. 9, Nos. 20 and 21, do not read the word at all. No. 12 has וטובו. Whereas 20 and 21 omit the Biblical verse at the end, it is present in No. 12. But it is possible that it was not always so fixed, for No. 26 has in its stead Psalm civ. 24, מה רבו מעשיך¹.

Some fragments show variants in the more lengthy Yotser generally accepted, which, although not exactly essential, are, at least in some cases, worthy of mention. Firstly, there is an extension of the rhymes at the beginning to be noted. Bodl. Heb. f. 29 (*Catal.*, 2729), fol. 60 a headed יוצר חול runs: יוצר אור . . . את הכל. אור עולם אוצר חיים יוצר אור . . . המאיר . . . מלאה הארץ משפטיך. המלך המרומם לבדו מאו וטוב ומתנשא מימות עולם (sic) אלהי עולם יי ברחמין הרבים רחם עלינו

¹ Cf. *J. Q. R.*, X, 654. In Bodl. Heb. f. 29 and 30 (*Catal.*, 2729, 30) also, which contain the long Yotser, the last verse is wanting.

אדון עזינו צור משגבנו מן בערינו חנינו וענינו. A similar amplification of the rhyme is presented in Bodl. Heb. f. 30 (Catal., 2730), fol. 38 a: חום ורחם עלינו אדון עזינו. וצור משגבנו מן ישענו משגב בערינו שמע שועתינו חנינו וענינו. However, it must be remarked that we have here to do with a Yotser for the Sabbath¹.

The Alphabet in the Yotser was recognized by Rapoport as a later addition². Cod. Bodl. Heb. d. 51 (Catal., 2742), fol. 65 b offers a noteworthy and new instance in support of this. In it **אל ברוך גרול דעה** is indeed present, but not yet embodied in the Yotser, being appended to the eulogy as a separate paragraph. Although the fragment is "much stained" and difficult to read, this much can be determined with certainty³.

The most detailed insertion in the Yotser is supplied in the description of the hosts of the heavenly court, of the ministering angels—**מעשה מרכבה** it is called in the Halakhot Gedolot; as the song of these angels the Kedusha is introduced. In Amram's Siddur the introduction of the Kedusha is ascribed to the **יורדי מרכבה** (p. 4 a), that is the Mystics of the early Gaonic period. For them expansion of the prayers and particularly the deep contemplation of the Merkaba served as means of inducing an ecstatic condition. Dr. Bloch⁴ has proved the connexion of this movement with the tenor and form of the Kedusha in the Yotser by numerous conclusive instances, and I am fully in accord with his arguments. It has been proved above on other grounds that the Palestinian Yotser did not contain the

¹ S. Schechter published a similar fragment from the Taylor-Schechter collection in the *Gedenkbuch für David Kaufmann* (דוד קאופמן, p. 54): אלהי: עולם מלכינו ברחמיך הרבים רחם עלינו אדון עזנו וצור משגבנו אלהי ישענו שבע שועתנו וחנונו ועננו שגבנו בעזוחך והדריכנו באמתך ולמד ?? דיים ויושר אשר לא נכשל אל ברוך גרול דעה . . .

² Rapoport, קליר, note 20.

³ Saadia has one more Alphabet. Cf. Bondi, *Der Siddur des R. Saadia Gaon*, Frankfurt, 1904, p. 17.

⁴ Ph. Bloch, *Die Mystiker der Gaonenzeit und ihr Einfluss auf die Liturgie*, in the *Monatsschrift*, XXXVII. See especially pp. 261, 305 ff.

Kedusha. We now know with what zealous activity the Babylonians worked for the spread of the Kedusha. A recently discovered Responsum¹ takes us right into the midst of the dispute which the Babylonians waged even in Palestine for the sake of their idea, and in their contention they remained victors. The fragmentary condition of the Responsum conceals something of the state of affairs ; but this much at least we do see, that the old tradition, the religious propriety, and the deep learning of a man like Jehudai Gaon were powerless against the onslaught of the pious enthusiasts of Babylon, and that against all right usage the spread of the Kedusha was forcibly effected by them. The prayer formulae of the Mystics are characterized by their prolixity and by an exuberant copiousness of synonyms which convey no added meaning. In accordance with this characteristic, the text of our section was sometimes even more wordy than it is now in the current prayer books. In the fragment published by Prof. Schechter it runs : תתרומו צורנו וגואלנו בורא קדושים : ישתבח שמך מלכנו יוצר משרתים אשר משרתיו אלה אלפי אלפים עמדים . . . לפניו רבו רבי רבבות סובבים את כסאו כלם אהובים . . .

There is also another passage in the daily Yotser connected with the name of Saadia, in which the custom of the different countries differed : אמר אדוננו סעדיה אסור לומר : "ואור חדש על ציון תאיר" בברכה זו, מה טעם לפי שאין אנו מברכין על האור העתיד להיות לימות המשיח, אלא על האור שאנו רואין בכל בקר ובקר, כענין שאנו מברכין בערב המעריב ערבים, אבל אם בא לומר מוציא שם שמים לבטלה. The opposite opinion was represented by the Babylonian Geonim : וכן מצאתי בשם רב שרירא גאון זצ"ל : שהשיב ואשר אמר מר רב סעדיה גאון זצ"ל שאין שלח צבור רשאי לומר ואור חדש לא כך הוא אצלנו אלא בשתי ישיבות מעולם אומרים ואור חדש על וכו' ולא על אותו האור מברכין אלא הזכרה בעלמא שמוכירין אותו ומי שאינו אומר לא הפסיד² Saadia defended the custom

¹ J. Q. R., XVIII, p. 112.

² שבילי הלוקט, p. 7a. Cf. *Siddur Amram*, 4 b ; *Tur. Orach Chayyim*, 59. In a Gaonic Responsum (Bodl. MS. Heb. d. 46, fol. 143 b) the following

of Palestine, and his opinion has largely carried the day; for the Sephardic and Italian Minhag have, in fact, not accepted the sentence, and in the Franco-German ritual an authority like Rashi pronounced against it. In the manuscripts of the Genizah it is for the most part not to be found, but where it does occur the text is expanded. Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 17: ואור חדש על ציון תאיר כדבר: שנ' קומי אורי כי בא אורך¹ ובדברי קדשך כתוב לאמר אל יי ויאר לנו והתקין מאורות לשמח עולם ונר משיח תאיר לנו בקרוב ונוכה כולנו מהרה לאורו. A variation from this is offered by Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 22: האומר לירושלים קומי אורי: . . . אור חדש. . . According to these examples the accepted אור חדש appears almost as a compromise and as the least measure of concession which had to be granted.

The Yotser could be subjected to paitanic expansions over and above those to which we are accustomed. Instances lie ready to hand in all rituals for the Sabbath service. הכל יודוך is, at the beginning, a poem joining on to the last word הכל of the preceding eulogy, at the end a kind of Midrash to אין ערוך לך. The section אל ארון is a conversion of the alphabetically worded דעה גדול אל ברוך גדול into the alphabetically versed בפי ומבורך בפי המעשים. ברוך ומבורך בפי המעשים. אל ארון על כל המעשים. כל נשמה גדלו . . . דעת . . .² The close of the insertion contains the most important element, the formula for the particular day לאל אשר שבת. Such embellishments have come down to us only for the Sabbath; at one time, however, similar ones were in use for other days of the week; they were tacked on to the account of the creation and to the particular Psalm of the day. This is shown clearly by the following fragment from Cambridge (Taylor-Schechter

passage occurs: ומנהאנא בי מדראשי קביעי דנהרעא ודסורא ערין למיכור ואור: (Cowley, חדש ואע"פ ד' סעריה ז' הוה ליה ריש מחיבתא בסורא לא קבילו מניה אפילו בחייה Catalogue, p. 40).

¹ Cf. also *Manhig*, § 31, Orhot Hayyim, f. 11a; Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 61.

² Cf. Landshut's commentary in his הניחין לב, p. 285. It must be remarked that in the MS. Bodl. Heb. f. 30, fol. 38a, above mentioned, הכל figures, whereas אל ארון is still wanting.

H. 9, No. 27): lacuna נים מבטן : אילו מעשה יום החמשי שבו נבראו ארץ והמליטה בהמות רמושים חיות : שרצי ימים ויום החמישי משבח ואומר הרנינו לאלהים עוזנו הריעו לאלהי יעקב: לפיכך יברכו לאל חי כל יצוריו שבח וגדולה ותפארת יתנו לאל בורא שרצי ימים ורמשי חלד תתברך וגו'.

As author of לאל אשר שבת the Gaon Natronai is usually cited¹; it seems, however, that here a tendency of another and earlier school finds expression, and we should regard Natronai as the first who quotes these older poems. I venture to suppose that these insertions are also of Palestinian origin, and that they were first brought into use in Palestine and in the lands which, in matters of ritual, stood under its influence. Positive proofs for this hypothesis cannot be given; but whereas Babylon—which was hostile to the Piut—was the home of Mysticism, Palestine was that of the Piut. Moreover, we can take the following analogy into account. As is well known, Saadia's Siddur contains in the Friday evening service the expansion of the paragraphs belonging to the Shema which begins: אשר כלה מעשיו. In Babylon these sections had been rejected by his predecessors². Notwithstanding, Saadia accepted them and the Roman Siddur has kept them up to the present day. It is not so generally known that Saadia's Siddur—the publication of which still remains a *pium desideratum*—also contains the corresponding insertions for the service for the conclusion of the Sabbath: אל המבריל בין קרש לחול. . . . ומצפין לנונה אור. The piece recurs in numerous Genizah fragments, and it must, at one time, have been very widely spread. In Babylon these sections were rejected, in Egypt, on the other hand, and in Italy they were adopted, since both these lands stood under the influence of Palestine. In the Holy Land paitanic amplifications of every sort were very popular, the lively fancy of the Palestinian Jews requiring variation in the prayers as frequently as they enjoyed it in the reading of the Thora and in Midrash.

¹ Landshut, *ibid.*; Zunz, *Gottesd. Vorträge*, p. 370. ² *Siddur Amram*, p. 25a.

So also the second of the paragraphs preceding the Shema has been subjected to alteration and expansion. It has already been mentioned that it is called ברכת תורה in the Talmud, and the circumstances in which this eulogy can be used for the study of the Thora are there discussed. Further, a comparison with the corresponding prayer in the evening service allows us to determine that the contents of the eulogy were originally limited to the thanks for the revelation on Mount Sinai. The lengthy affirmation of trust in God and the prayer for the restoration of the Jewish nation did not figure here from the beginning, and, in fact, are not in keeping with this part of the prayer. The Talmud knows of a difference in the wording of the opening of our paragraph. The difference itself is very unessential, as it is only a question whether the first two words should be אהבת עולם or אהבה רבה. And yet how many pens has this variant set to work! It has even produced an alteration in the text of the Talmud. For while the best authors of the Middle Ages¹ quote the Talmud as preferring אהבת עולם, it appears from our editions as if אהבה רבה is recommended. Let us set out the text of the editions and that of Alfassi side by side:

Alfassi, ad loc.	Ber. 11 b.
ברכה שניה מאי היא אמר רב	ואידך מאי היא אמר רב יהודה
יהודה אמר שמואל אהבה רבה	אמר שמואל אהבה רבה וכן אורי
אהבתנו ורבנן אמרי אהבת עולם	ליה רבי אלעזר לר' פדת בריה
תניא נמי הכי אין אומרין אהבה רבה	אהבה רבה תניא נמי הכי אין אומרים
אלא אהבת עולם וכן הוא אומר	אהבת עולם אלא אהבה רבה ורבנן
ואהבת עולם אהבתך :	אמרי אהבת עולם וכן הוא אומר
	ואהבת עולם אהבתך על כן משכתיך
	חסד :

The difference is very old and the compromise was quite

¹ Cf. *Halakhot Gedolot*, R. Hananel; *Eshkol*, *Shibbole ha-Leket*; the Munich MS. (cf. *דקדוקי סופרים*, I, 49) reads: נתן אומר אין : אומרים אהבה רבה אלא אהבת עולם וכה"א אהבת עולם אהבתך.

early effected, that both beginnings should be used alternately in the two daily services: וכתב רב צמה נאן וצ"ל יש מקומות שאומרים אהבה רבה ויש מקומות שאומרים אהבת עולם אלא שאל מר הר"ר יעקב את רב חנונאי ז"ל מפני מה אומרים אהבה רבה והא תניא כרבנן דאמרי אהבת עולם. ואמר לו בשחר אנו אומרים אהבה רבה ובערב אנו אומרים אהבת עולם (*Shibbole ha-Leket*, § 14, p. 7 a). This compensation was accepted, however, only in France and Germany¹. In the Orient אהבה was rigorously excluded, although some Geonim, among them Amram, broke a lance in its favour. The record of this dispute is given us in Abudraham: וכתב מר רב כהן צדק שיש לקיים דברי שניהם ולומר שחרית אהבה רבה וערבית אהבת עולם וכן כתוב בסדר רב עמרם וכ"כ מר שר שלום שנהגו מכאן ואילך בישיבה כן. ורבינו שרירא ורבינו האי כתבו אין אנו מאמינים שמר שר שלום אמר כן לפי שלא נאמר כן בנהרדעא מעולם אהבה רבה לא בשחרית ולא בערבית ולא בעלים ופרס ומדי וכל מדרשות שבסורא אין אומרים אלא אהבת עולם חוץ ממדרש אחד ומדמים אנו שבאותו היה רגיל מר רב צדק Usage decided in favour of Sherira, and of the eight Genizah fragments which lie before me only two have אהבה רבה², all the others אהבת עולם.

We can hardly understand why such an insignificant alteration should be so energetically discussed and disputed. But the Genizah helps us to comprehend it, by showing that this difference hangs together with another—the prayer for the restoration of the Jewish nation. Whether the formula runs as in the German ritual והביאנו לשלום, or as in the Sephardic and Italian rituals, והבא עלינו ברכה ושלום מארבע כנפות הארץ, the meaning remains much the same and, in either case, it introduces

¹ Cf. *Tosafot Ber.*, 11 b, ורבנן; *Maimuniot* in שמוע' I, 6. The *Mahzor Vitry* reads in the general part, p. 9, ואומר אהבה רבה, but in the text of the prayer, p. 65, אהבה עולם. Some texts of the Franco-German school read in the Talmud *Yerushalmi* even the words אהבה רבה, but these words are not found there. Cf. the very careful collection of the texts in Ratner *to Berakhot*, p. 23 ff.

² Taylor-Schechter Collection H. 9, Nos. 17 and 22.

a prayer which does not belong to the context. The Genizah fragments show the remarkable fact that, with only *one* exception, *this particular prayer is absent every time from the section when beginning* אהבה עולם, whereas it is contained in the paragraph when beginning אהבה רבה. Only Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 19, combines them, as does the later Sephardic ritual. A difference of principle appears to underlie this, but its explanation we must leave to the future.

I must here pass over the materially unimportant variants in the original body of the section, as I have not the texts in their wording at present before me¹. Towards the end, in the prayer for redemption, the variations again become considerable, another proof perhaps that this piece is a later addition. On account of its simplicity, I will here cite the most elaborate setting that lies before me (Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 18): והאר עינינו . . . אהבה עולם במצותיך ודבק לבנו ביראתיך ויחד . . . ותמלך עלינו מהרה אתה לבדך ושם קדשך באמת נקרא עלינו בעבור שמך האל הגדול הנבור והנורא מהירה באהבה תאיר עינינו ותושיעינו כך בטחנו לא נבוש ובשמך חסינו לא נכלם ולא נכשל עד עולמי עד כי בנו בחרת מכל עם ולשן.

"Variationen im Text eines so uralten Gebets wie das Sch'ma wird kein Verständiger bei einer Überlieferung aus der Zeit wie die der Mishna etwa erwarten²." These words, written twenty years ago on the discovery of some inscriptions, are still fully justified to-day.

But the blessing following the Biblical passages offers in itself a little piece of history, *in nuce* a reflection of the development of the liturgical service in general. אמת ויציב is a name that figures in the oldest notices about regular services that we possess (*Tamid*, 5, 1; *Ber.*, 2, 1), and some such piece is certainly as old as the public service itself. But it was, neither in text nor in usage, identical with the

¹ A very short formula is to be found, *J. Q. R.*, X, 654.

² Landauer in *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1884, p. 934.

section that bears that name to-day. We must not confuse the two parts in our piece, but must separate clearly the *אמת ויציב* (beginning with *עזר* or *עזרת*) from the true *אמת ויציב*. In later times, the *אמת ויציב* seemed to be the more important part; in earlier times *אמת ויציב* alone was in its true position, and bore a suitable meaning. The Biblical passages that were recited in the daily prayers needed an epilogue. It was insufficient to repeat them as bare paragraphs of profession of faith; it was felt necessary to add a direct acceptance and acknowledgement of them. They were not received into the liturgy as rigid and lifeless formulae, but as powerful and effective affirmations of belief. Each day they were acknowledged anew, each day freshly accepted¹. In the oldest service, where the number of passages taken from the Pentateuch as professions of belief was greater, this acceptance had a deeper meaning than in later times. Moreover, the introduction of *ויאמר* broke up its close connexion. Yet the knowledge of the real facts was kept alive for many centuries where they drew from the old Palestinian sources; in Rome, up to the Middle Ages, it was known that *אמת ויציב* referred exclusively to the two first sections of the *שמע*².

If we look to the original facts, an important difficulty is solved. The Halakhists discuss the question why our piece does not begin with *ברוך*, and the answer is always given that it is *ברכה הסמוכה לחברתה*. But this answer is by no means satisfactory. A convincing explanation can only be given by History. *אמת ויציב* is certainly older than the technique of the *Berakha*; it has formed part of the liturgy from its very beginning, from the times when the service consisted simply of the profession of faith. This was introduced by a blessing *ב' תורה*, and terminated

¹ Cf. *Sifre Deut.* § 33: אדם סופרה אלא שלא יהו בעיניך כדיוסנמא ישה שאין אדם סופרה אלא (ed. Friedmann, 74 a). Cf. *Pesikta* בחורש, ed. Buber, 102 a.

² *Shibbole ha-Leket*, 16, ed. Buber, 8 a: וגאון רומא וצ"ל פירשו דאמת ויציב אקריה: שפע קאי דאמר ושוב הדבר הזה שאמרת לקבל מלכותך וכן נראה לר' בנימין אחי נר"ו דאקריאת שמע קאי.

which we have already noticed with regard to the Yotser of the Babylonian mystics. While *אמח ויציב* seems to indicate Babylonian influence, the composition of the second part seems to have originated entirely in Palestine. They were Palestinian authorities who furthered and sanctioned the amplification of the piece. The style is that of the older Palestinian Piut. The expansion was early completed, so that the contents are everywhere the same¹, and there can hardly be found deviations worthy of notice in the prayer books of any ritual known to us. In spite of this agreement in wording and style it has nevertheless undergone changes, and the form in which we now have it, is not exactly the old Palestinian. In the first place the eulogy is, nowadays, *נאל ישראל*, and that is a Babylonian formula². In Palestine the formula was *צור ישראל ונאלו*, as shown above. This text occurs again in the Genizah fragments³, but is also in use in the German-Polish ritual on festival evenings, when Piutim are inserted. The Piut is a Palestinian creation, and when the German poets took it over, they adopted with it all its technique, and old formulae were preserved. On the same occasion in the German ritual *זה צור ישענו פצו פה ואמרו* is used instead of the customary *זה אלי ענו ואמרו*. This, too, is an old Palestinian formula, which we meet with not infrequently in the Genizah⁴. The alteration did not confine itself to these few details, but the whole conclusion, as we now possess it, is the result of modification and contraction. In Palestine the passage from the mention of the Red Sea was much more adapted to the text of the Midrash⁵, and was the same for morning and evening. A relic of it is preserved in the Siddur of the Gaon Rab

¹ A short formula from a Genizah fragment is given, *J. Q. R.*, X, 656.

² *Pesahim*, 117 ב: *נאל ויהלל גאל ישראל*.

³ e. g. Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 39.

⁴ Cf. e. g. Bodl. MS. Heb. e 36, fol. 17 (*Catal.* 2715, 3 d); Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 39, fol. 2 a.

⁵ *Mechilla*, ed. Friedmann, 35 a; *Bab. Sota*, 30 b.

Amram in the regular evening service (fol. 18 b seq.). We give the whole piece according to the fuller fragments of the Genizah: **מי כמכה . . . פלא מפי עוללים ויונקים שירה שמעת** על הים יחד כלם ענו ואמרו **י' מלכנו מלך אל חי וקיים שמך עלינו יי' יוצרנו יי' הושיענו חוס ורחם עלינו ברחמך הרבים כי אל חנון ורחום טוב אתה יי' מלך יי' מלך יי' ימלך לעולם ועד קיים עלינו יי' אלהינו מלכותו וכבודו גדלו ותפארתו וקדושתו וקדושת שמו הגדול הוא יי' אלהינו ירחם עלינו וירוח לנו מכל צרתינו וינאל נאולה שלמה וימלך עלינו מהרה לעולם ועד באי צור ישראל וגואלו אמן¹**

The conclusion of the passage especially was the subject of dispute. In Babylon no addition to **ימלך לעולם ועד** was permitted, and such additions as were known were combated: **שיש מי שטועה ואומר מה שלא תקנו חז"ל כאן בגלל אבות**: **חושע בנים ותביא נאולה לבני בניהם²**. This, too, is an addition of Palestinian origin, used daily in the Italian ritual up to the present day. The German-Polish ritual, too, uses the same concluding formula on Pesah when it inserts the poems **ברא רודי** ³ at the end of the Geullah.

Amram's rule not to make any additions was not obeyed even in Spain; for there the verse Isa. xlvii. 4 was inserted. In Germany this verse roused opposition, and in its stead a prayer for redemption was allowed⁴. The formula now in use in the German ritual is quoted by Ibn Jarhi with the words **ויש נהנו לומר**. In the *Maḥzor Vitry* it is corrupt⁵.

¹ Bodl. MS. Heb. f. 29, fol. 62 a (*Catal.* 2729); Taylor-Schechter H. 9, No. 16, fol. 1 a; No. 18, fol. 3 b; No. 24, fol. 1. In the Palestinian ritual there were Piutim in the Yotser inserted before **ה' כלכנו**. Hence comes the repeated mention of these words in the Piutim of the Genizah, e. g. Bodl. MS. Heb. e. 37, ff. 48 b, 100, 103 (*Catal.* 2710); e. 39, ff. 2, 76 b, 80 (*Catal.* 2712); f. 32, fol. 45 (*Catal.* 2713); f. 29, fol. 13 (*Catal.* 2729), and very often. The note **מלכנו לסנארי יהיה אופנים ומאורות וכי** in MS. e. 36, fol. 21 b (*Catal.* 2715) is worthy of mention. In accordance with this the enumeration of the various classes of poems that make up the Yotser in Zunz, *Synagogale Poesie*, p. 63, and Brody and Albrecht, *שיר השיר*, p. 23, should be supplemented.

² *Siddur Amram*, p. 6 b. Cf. *Maḥzor Vitry*, p. 13.

³ Zunz, l. c., p. 64.

⁴ Cf. Baer *Siddur*, p. 86.

⁵ *Ha-Manhig*, § 40; *Vitry*, p. 66.

In conclusion we may mention two curiosities. The first, that the verse והוא רחום (Ps. lxxviii. 38) was said before ברכו also in the morning prayers, is not unknown. The second, now made known for the first time through the Genizah, is a special Berakha for פריסת שמע preceding ברכו, and running as follows: בא"י אמ"ה א"ק ב"ו להמליכו בלבב שלם¹ וליחרו בנפש חפצה¹.

I. ELBOGEN.

¹ Cf. J. Q. R., X, 654.